

## SECTION II—REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for a thorough review, and respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application for the following reasons:

### **Allowable subject matter**

Applicants acknowledge that claims 35, 38-43 and 46-50 are allowed over the prior art of record. Applicants have traversed the outstanding rejections and/or amended the claims to overcome the present rejections. Applicants therefore submit that all claims pending in the application are now in condition for allowance.

### **Objection to the Terminal Disclaimer filed July 09, 2009**

The present Office Action objects to the terminal disclaimer filed on July 9, 2009 on the grounds that the Power of Attorney submitted with the present application lists more than ten patent practitioners and does not separately specify which of the 83 patent practitioners listed is to be recognized by the Office in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.32(c)(3).

To overcome the present objection, Applicants respectfully re-submit concurrently herewith:

1. A copy of the original power of attorney;
2. A designation of practitioners to be recognized by the Office consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.32(c)(3); and
3. A new terminal disclaimer signed by a representative having power of attorney and designated to be recognized by the Office consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.32(c)(3).

Applicants respectfully submit that the above documents submitted concurrently herewith overcome the present objection and thus, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection and accept the Terminal Disclaimer presented.

### **Objections to the Specification**

The Office Action objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action stated that the term “computer-readable medium” in claims 46-50 was not defined by Applicants’ specification.

In accordance with the Examiner’s recommendation, Applicants have amended claims 46-50 to recite a “system-readable medium” in place of a “computer-readable medium.”

Applicants note for the record that independent claim 43 has additionally been amended herein to recite a “system-readable medium” in place of a “computer-readable medium,” although the claim is not objected to by the present Office Action.

Applicants further note for the record that the specification teaches that instructions may be stored upon, among other things, “computer-accessible media.” For example, paragraph 57 teaches in pertinent part:

[00057] Turning now to FIGs. 14-32, the particular methods associated with embodiments of the invention are described in terms of computer software and hardware with reference to a flowchart. ... Describing the methods by reference to a flowchart enables one of ordinary skill in the art to develop such **programs including such instructions to carry out the methods** on suitably configured computing devices (e.g., one or more processors of a node) executing **the instructions from computer-accessible media**.

Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting the present application toward as expeditious of an allowance as possible, Applicants adopt the Examiner’s recommended amendments to

overcome the present objection. Applicants submit that the amendments to the claims overcome the objection.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claims 46-50.

**Claims 51 and 54-58 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

The Office Action rejected claims 51 and 54-58 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action states, as per claim 51, the limitations including “means for receiving” (line 2), “means for specifying” (line 7), “means to selectively expose”(line 10), “means for unpacking” (line 14) and “means for deploying” (line 17) properly invokes 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph. The Office Action further states that the limitation “means for registering” in claim 54 also properly invokes 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph.

The Examiner, at page 6 of the Office Action, kindly recommends “rewriting claims 51 and 54” so as “not to invoke 35 [U.S.C. §] 112, second paragraph.”

In accordance with the Examiner’s recommendation, Applicants have amended claims 51, 54, 55, and 56 to no longer recite the “means for” language which was objected to by the Examiner. Claims 57 and 58 do not recite “means for language” directly, but were rejected due to their dependence upon the independent base claim that previously recited “means for” language.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims overcome the present rejection. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to claims 51 and 54-58.

## CONCLUSION

Given the above amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance. If the undersigned attorney has overlooked subject matter in any of the cited references that is relevant to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such subject matter may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (503) 439-8778.

### **Charge Deposit Account**

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully Submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

/Gregory D. Caldwell/

Gregory D. Caldwell  
Registration No. 39,926  
Attorney for Applicants

January 13, 2010

Date

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP  
1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
Telephone: (503) 439-8778  
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073